

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 1, 1992**

Present: Chairman Jeff Chretien, Dick Dresher, Kathi Izatt, Mick Johnson, Elaine McKay, Mark Green, Mike Holmes; Barbara Holt, City Council Representative; Jack Balling, City Engineer; Blaine K. Gehring, Planning and Redevelopment Director; Jon Reed Boothe, Planning Director; Shirley Chevalier, Recording Secretary **Absent:** Don Milligan

Chairman Chretien called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

The minutes of August 18, 1992 were unanimously approved as written.

Subdivisions - Preliminary:

9-1-92.6A Stone Ridge Subdivision Plat G 14 Lots, 1400 South 1900 East, Joe Featherstone, Developer

This subdivision is part of the original Stone Ridge development plan. It has now been completed except for Plat B. When it was originally developed, two areas, one in the north and one in the east, were left out for future development. The section to the east has the road installed and has been completed, but it was unplatted with the exception of one lot. The overall plat was approved but 6 lots are on dedicated roads. They are much larger than the Foothill Ordinance requires and all of the improvements have been installed. This is not an agenda Rem, but Mr. Balling felt the Planning Commission should let them continue with the development of the project. When it came in for preliminary approval, they indicated this would be forthcoming at a later date. It should be approved subject to the same conditions of all the other lots. The improvements have been done and the bonds are in place.

The submittal this evening is for the north section. This area was part of the original Stone Ridge development and will contain the culinary reservoir which serves this development. There are two lots, 704 and 706, that are located in the area being considered for annexation. These lots are being proposed as flag lots. There are 40 acres of property that have been acquired. Half of the 40 acres will be developed, the rest (19.5 acres) will be donated to Bountiful City. This will go down the drainage of Barton Creek and will be used by Bountiful City for an access road to the property to the east and to the trail head, etc. It will also be the city access road to the reservoir. There may be some adjustment to this road. The developers are concerned about the impact on lot 707. They want to get the road flagged and locate it where it has the least impact to the hillside. They will dedicate an access easement to the city.

The preliminary review has been made and staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The lots are very large and have useable space as required by ordinance;
2. The roads are less than 12% grade and meet the required conditions;
3. The cut and fill for the proposed roads exceed the 10 ft. maximum required by ordinance. A variance is requested for excessive cut and fill of 300 ft.; (in order to make the loop road to tie the two areas together, it is imperative this be done. There will be a revegetation plan on the areas that have a 2-1 slope. Mr. Balling said it is a rock outcropping and they may be able to make the slope 1.25-1);
4. The cul-de-sac is 350 ft. long and serves three lots. It meets the requirements of the ordinance. Staff recommends sidewalk be placed on only one side of the cul-de-sac in front of the lots it serves and not around the circle. This is to preserve the open space and reduce the cuts and fills along the cul-de-sac;
5. The storm drainage will be picked up at the lower end of the street and conveyed in a pipe to the Stone Ridge detention basin.

Mr. Balling reminded commissioners that this is just preliminary approval, and when they come back for final approval, all the details pertaining to the access road, revegetation, etc. will be presented.

Mike Holmes said he would prefer dealing with the agenda item this evening, and deal with the other 6 lots another time with staff recommendations.

Mike Holmes made a motion to recommend to City Council, preliminary approval of Stone Ridge Subdivision Plat F, 1400 South 1900 East, subject to their compliance with the conditions outlined by staff, and #3 to include that they will revegetate the area of fill, and add #6, the access road to the water tank is subject to the City Engineer working with the developers. Elaine McKay seconded the motion; Kathi Izatt opposed; Mark Green and Mick Johnson abstained; Elaine McKay, Dick Dresher, Mike Holmes, Barbara Holt, and Jeff Chretien voted in favor of the motion.

9-1-92.6B Windsor Park Subdivision, 6 Lots, 11 Acres, 2050 East Ridge Hill Drive, Marv Blosch, Developer

This item was postponed to allow the court to rule on a lawsuit filed August 31, 1992.

Subdivisions - Final:

9-1-92.7A Maple Hills #4, Termination of two streets into cul-de-sacs: Maple Cove Drive and Cove Lane

Preliminary approval was granted by the Planning Commission on November 5, 1991 and by City Council on November 13, 1991, at which time they wanted to terminate the roads in a cul-de-sac rather than complete the loop road. The Planning Commission felt that the cul-de-sacs, even though longer than the 600 ft. allowed by ordinance, would not cut up the hillside as much as building 1500 ft.

more of road.

When the final plats came in, the road pretty well followed the same alignment. The cul-de-sac is very similar to the way it was proposed for preliminary approval, but they changed some alignments on the final plan. By moving the road 100 ft. east of where it was shown on the preliminary plat, they found they could cut this cul-de-sac back to about 100 ft. deep instead of 350 ft. It will be at the end of the existing stub road. The lower cul-de-sac has been cut back 50 ft.

Staff has reviewed the final plats for compliance with the ordinance and the findings are as follows:

1. The cul-de-sac on Plat B is 1050 ft. long and an exception should be granted as per the preliminary approval;
2. The cul-de-sac on Plat C is 900 ft. long and the same exception as outlined in #1 above should be granted;
3. Lot 5C, Subdivision C, is not a useable lot. The owners wish to sell it with the adjacent lot 21. A note should be placed on the lot, "This is not an approved building lot;
4. Lot 4C does not have sufficient area for a useable building under the water reservoir, and the boundary line should be changed to meet the building pad requirement;
5. A disclaimer note should be added to the plat that "No building will be allowed above elevation 5810 mean sea level";
6. The final plats are still being reviewed and are subject to the engineering corrections;
7. The cul-de-sacs are located on property that slopes between 25% and 30%. We would recommend that the sidewalk be terminated at the beginning of the cul-de-sac to avoid the large cut and fill on the hillside. The sidewalk would still continue out of the circle, however the cut and fill could be reduced from 16 ft. to 11 ft. and would lessen the impact on the hillside.

The cul-de-sacs sit on property that is 25-30% grade. To put the sidewalk in requires a 108 ft. diameter which tears up the whole hillside. There would be 15 ft. of cut and fill plus the slopes. To lessen that impact on the hillside, staff recommends the sidewalks terminate at the circle on both sides, and not require the sidewalk inside the turnaround. That will keep the cuts and fills down to about 11-12 ft. The city would still maintain the ownership of the strip. Mr. Balling said he sees no need for the sidewalk to go around the circle as long as there are sidewalks along the sides coming out of the circle to serve the frontage of all the lots. He feels it is a good trade-off to eliminate the sidewalk to reduce the cut and fill across the circle.

Staff recommends final approval be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Completion of the review items outlined above;
2. Furnishing a guarantee bond for the improvements as outlined by the City Engineer;
3. Payment of all required fees;
4. Furnishing a landscape plan and bond for the areas which will be impacted by grading along the side of the roadway;
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Foothill Ordinance except for the areas where a variance is granted.

Mike Holmes asked what would be wrong with sidewalk adjacent to the curb, without the park strip. We require sidewalks from everybody on a dedicated street because they are a safety issue. It is inconsistent not to have a sidewalk there unless safety is really not an issue. The problem is consistency. What we are doing here, will we do for the next developer?

Kathi Izatt said we have already granted them extra footage on the length of the cul-de-sacs, and we should not grant further variances to go against our own ordinance and delete the sidewalks.

Mr. Balling said he feels sidewalks are absolutely essential, particularly on roads with through traffic. In the foothill areas, the preamble is to preserve the natural space and not to cut it up anymore than we have to and try to blend in with the topography. However, at the end of a cul-de-sac, the traffic is not moving. We have to look at what is best for the development of the community.

Barbara Holt referred to the two issues: sidewalks vs scarring of the hillside, and being consistent vs "common sense" regarding sidewalks. If it is a safety issue and we need to be consistent because of safety, then we have to look at the fact that we are compromising that safety when we put in sidewalks without a park strip. The park strip makes the difference. Without it you might as well not have the sidewalk.

Mick Johnson is in favor of reducing the scarring and the cuts and fills.

Dick Dresher said he felt comfortable with staff's review. He does not like to disturb the hillside any more than necessary, but he feels staff is consistent in their review and looks at each individual situation when making a recommendation.

Mark Green said he is entirely in favor of sidewalks being mandatory, but he agrees that keeping the hillside cut as small as possible is worth eliminating the sidewalk around the cul-de-sac.

Mick Johnson made a motion to grant final approval to Maple Hills Subdivision #4, Plats B & C, subject to staff's recommendations; Dick Dresher seconded the motion; Kathi Izatt opposed; approval was by majority.

Commercial Application:

9-1-92.1 OA Preliminary Site Plan Approval, Commercial Building for Dee Erickson, 111 South 500 West

This site is the former Aamco Transmission building which Mr. Erickson plans to remodel and clean up the property. Future plans are for a new building on the site, to be considered tonight for conceptual approval as part of the overall plan. This building will be designed for a future tenant, and a new site plan will be submitted and approved when a tenant has been determined. The existing structure will be used for two to four retail spaces. The overhead doors will be replaced with windows and entry doors. Parking is adequate and a verbal agreement for cross easements has been reached with the owners of the Bountiful Central Plaza building (Meineke Muffler) for a traffic connection to the rear of their building. There will be new landscaping along the rear of the site and new landscape setbacks across the front. Existing landscaping will be refurbished. An existing chain link fence in the rear will remain and will be upgraded. Payment of an impact fee will provide storm drainage off site.

The proposed building has a drive through; however, if a tenant for this building does not require it, the structure will be shifted providing a wider area for traffic access. There is one driveway for Ingress and egress. The parking is right angle. Commissioners felt it would be difficult to have people backing out of the parking spaces, going to the east end of the property and turning around before they could exit. The cross easement would relieve this situation and Mr. Erickson stated that the adjoining property owners were anxious to open up the easement for traffic flow since it would also benefit them. Regarding the issue of cleaning up the weeds on the empty pad area and keeping them cleaned up as they grow back, Mr. Gehring suggested since most of the pad would be in paving, it could be sterilized.

Staff recommends preliminary site plan approval with the area shown as "future construction" receiving conceptual approval only at this time. In addition, final site plan to include a detailed landscape plan and a draft copy of the cross easement between Mr. Erickson and the owners of Bountiful Central Plaza.

Kathi Izatt made a motion to grant preliminary site plan approval on 111 South 500 West as presented in the staff report dated August 26, 1992, with the additions that the paved area of the parking lot will extend to the future building lot, and that the future building lot area will either be grass or sterilized, whichever Mr. Erickson prefers; that we grant conceptual approval to the area which will be a future building, reiterating the requirement for the cross easement between the two properties. Mark Green seconded the motion; voting was unanimous.

Miscellaneous:

9-1-92.11 A Consider building lot next to Bridlewood Acres, #20 West Monarch Drive, Blair Fredrickson

Near Bridlewood Subdivision, there is a large tract of undeveloped land that is part of the Wood Estate and part of the Hooper Canyon drainage way. Mr. Fredrickson has purchased a building lot which is contiguous to the Bridlewood Subdivision. It has 80 ft. of frontage on Monarch Drive, contains about 24,000 sq. ft., and meets all the requirements of the foothill zone. This is a one lot subdivision and must follow all requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance.

Staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Providing a 7 ft. utility easement along the west and south property lines;
2. Payment of a storm detention fee in the amount of \$1,155.00;
3. Payment of required utility fees for power, sewer and water;
4. Posting a cash deposit at the time the building permit is issued to guarantee repair and/or replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter;
5. Payment of required subdivision fee of \$30.00;
6. Payment for repair of road for utility installation.

Kathi Izatt asked if all the rest of this land remained in the Wood's ownership. Mr. Balling said Glen Hollow PUD is in the upper half, with its common area in the lower half of the development. Except for a small portion of ground that is less than 30%, the rest of it is too steep to develop or is in the flood plain of Hooper Canyon.

Kathi Izatt made a motion to approve the building lot at 20 West Monarch Drive with the 6 recommendations proposed by staff dated August 25, 1992; Barbara Holt seconded the motion; voting was unanimous.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.